

MONO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

P.O. Box 347
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
(760) 924-1800, fax 924-1801
commdev@mono.ca.gov

P.O. Box 8
Bridgeport, CA 93517
(760) 932-5420, fax 932-5431
www.monocounty.ca.gov

SPECIAL MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 2003 - 10 A.M.
JUNE LAKE COMMUNITY CENTER, JUNE LAKE
(Adopted July 10, 2003)

1. **OPENING OF MEETING:** Chair Bill Waite called the meeting to order at 10:13 a.m.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Jamie Beck, Mono County Child Care Council, presented a flyer on upcoming workshops in Mammoth Lakes and Bridgeport entitled "The Economic Impact of Child Care." She indicated that 23 counties have childcare sections in their General Plan, and suggested Mono County ought to consider same.
3. **MEETING MINUTES:** Review and approve minutes of May 8, 2003.
MOTION: Adopt the minutes as submitted. (Kattelmann/Bush. Ayes: 4-0. Abstain due to absence: Waite.)
4. **CONSENT AGENDA:** *TRACT MAP 37-49A/Rimrock Ranch Phase 6. Staff: Denice Hutten*
Hutten indicated that this item would go to the Mono Supervisors June 17 if accepted by the Planning Commission.
MOTION: Accept the Tract Map 37-49A/Rimrock Ranch Phase 6. (Miller/Bush. Ayes: 5-0.)
5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 37-51/Wofford. *The proposed project would divide assessor's parcel number 26-090-38, totaling 98.5 acres, into 17 lots. The property is located approximately 1.5 miles north of the community of Chalfant on the west side of Hwy. 6. The property is designated Rural Mobile Home, with a 2- and 5-acre minimum lot size (RMH 2 and RMH 5) in the General Plan. The project is consistent with the General Plan. Environmental Analysis was done in conformance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. Staff: Keith Hartstrom*

Due to conflicting information on the meeting site, the chair ordered a recess until 10:30 a.m. to determine whether anyone had traveled to Bridgeport for this item.

Senior Planner Keith Hartstrom summarized the project. He concluded that the site is physically suitable for the proposed development, the density is in compliance, and the project is not likely to cause substantial impacts to surrounding areas or to wildlife. California DFG did not submit a comment letter.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING:

Steve Toomey, Don Wofford's partner, suggested changing the term "applicant" to "applicant/property owner" in Conditions of Approval & Mitigation Monitoring Program, items 1-9. Toomey agreed to put up bonding for any utilities not yet installed, and to work with Denice Hutten at Public Works. He indicated a willingness to build 24' privately owned/maintained roads that would meet fire-safe standards. He noted that two roads currently serve the area.

John Langford of Bear Engineering indicated that Public Works wants compaction tests performed. The main issues are paving, and whether the two access roads conform to standards? Paving could be waived if not appropriate to this area. It was suggested that Public Works eliminate the paving requirement, and accept 24' roads.

DISCUSSION:

Denice Hutten of Public Works indicated that the Brown subdivision and White Mountain Estates have paved, county-dedicated roads. The right of way was dedicated to Mono County, but the county would not be responsible for maintaining the roads. One commissioner thought the road seemed adequate, but noted that subsequent paving would require a two-thirds vote of the lot owners and be at county expense. Another commissioner thought two access points to split up the traffic and reduce the impact would probably make paving unnecessary. The Director of Public Works could be given discretion to vary from county road standards.

MOTION: After discussion, the original motion was reworded: 1) adopt Sections A, B and C of the staff report, but remove the road section; 2) recommend to Public Works director that paving not be required; and 3) replace "applicant" with "applicant/property owner," as described above. (Shipley/Miller. Ayes: 5-0.)

B. DRAFT JUNE LAKE TRAIL PLAN (continued public hearing from May 8, 2003). *Consider recommending to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the June Lake Area Plan to include the June Lake Trail Plan as an appendix. Staff: Larry Johnston*

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING:

The present plan is a consolidation of previous trail plan efforts in the General Plan, the June Lake Area Plan, the June Lake Multi-modal Plan, and documents dating back to the early 1990s. This plan would be adopted as an appendix to the June Lake Area Plan. Senior Planner Larry Johnston provided a brief summary of a yearlong trail planning process that included workshops, meetings, site visits, notification of June Lake Loop owners, direct mail, post office box holder notification and postings. Despite extensive outreach, only three citizens attended the May 8 Planning Commission hearing. It was pointed out that additional input had been received via numerous petitions and response letters, as well as attendees at previous Citizens Advisory Committee meetings. Moreover, the June Lake CAC had incorporated these comments into the trail plan document it ultimately recommended.

Johnston outlined additional changes that have been made in response to citizen comments as detailed in the staff report.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Steve Ganong, on behalf of Sierra Cycling Foundation, Eastside Velo and cyclists from Carson City, Sacramento, Gardnerville and Reno, supported the intent, as shown in Appendix B of the trail plan, to make Hwy. 158 more bicycle/pedestrian friendly. At little cost, Caltrans could make Hwy. 158 safer by minor changes such as shifting lines, narrowing lanes, and converting gutters into uphill bike lanes. Signs to "Share the Road" have been effective. A letter from the director of Caltrans District 9 suggested deleting the entire Appendix. Ganong supported leaving Appendix B in the document, indicating it had many good ideas for Hwy. 158 bicycle and vehicle safety.

Steve Agajanian, USFS permittee, expressed environmental and fiscal concerns regarding "mid-slope" trail sections by his cabin near Boulder Lodge, plus effects on personal property and quality of life. He feared theft, vandalism and belligerent fishermen. Instead of further study, he recommended skirting the problematic section with the most cost-effective route around that area.

Roger Ginsburg, USFS permittee and neighbor of Agajanian, indicated he did not oppose the trail plan, but did oppose the placement of that portion of the trail referred to as the “mid-slope” trail. He suggested that the trail should be routed along Hwy. 158 and asked that the Planning Commission strike the word “mid-slope.” He noted that the USFS is under funded and unable or unwilling to maintain what it has. He contended that a mid-slope trail would forever change the slope, and do tremendous damage to the hillside and trees. “Don’t place a burden on us now that will cause nothing but problems,” he implored.

Jim Davis, Petersen Tract property owner, inquired whether second homeowners had been notified of this meeting. His primary concerns were security for second homeowners who had brought land adjacent to USFS for privacy, and a decline in property values for those close to equestrian, bicycle and foot trails.

Norman Roe, June Lake resident, indicated a split image is presented: business owners would like others to come here, but property owners say, “I’m here; if you come here, go away.” He visualizes a beautiful area where people could have an enjoyable experience, and that would include non-motorized trails. CLOSE PUBLIC COMMENT.

DISCUSSION:

Planning consultant Sandra Bauer indicated that most suggestions could be incorporated into the plan. Johnston noted that the public hearing notice process to encourage citizen involvement went well beyond requirements. Only the tip of the iceberg [the process] is visible now.

CDD Director Scott Burns explained that the June Lake trail has been in the works for years as part of the countywide trails plan advocated by the Mono Supervisors. With new development coming into the area, a refined trail plan would be advisable. The trail through Intrawest property (Rodeo Grounds), a primary item, would need an EIR and Specific Plan to detail alignment.

One commissioner noted that people come to hike to outlying areas, not backyards. But, no matter how far a trail is from houses, it was contended that a certain amount of intrusion would occur. Staff indicated that the trail plan attempted to eliminate or reduce walking through properties by creating designated trails. Unless people are given the option to get around on a designated trail, there will be more people “peeking in windows.”

Questions arose on how the trail would be built. Staff responded that only a few new sections are proposed, and neither blasting nor bulldozing is envisioned. If a segment encounters problems, the path could be narrowed or rerouted. All proposed alignments would need on-site reconnaissance.

One suggestion was to require Intrawest to formulate a trail plan. Burns indicated that June Lake and Mono County, not Intrawest, should be in charge of the trail system. The June Lake Multi-modal Plan suggests that people get out of their cars and walk. With regard to the mid-slope trail, the CAC had considered putting the trail along the road, but it’s an avalanche area, with constant debris build-up. The CAC ultimately recommended a mid-slope trail at its public hearing.

MOTION: Adopt the trail plan with modifications: 1) include all trails except #31, which would be placed under study; 2) Delete wording “mid-slope” trail; 3) assign Parker/Walker segment as equestrian; and 4) recommend that USFS conduct a comprehensive environmental analysis of the entire trail plan. (Miller/Bush. Ayes: 5-0)

6. WORKSHOP:

A. “Investing for Prosperity”: Dr. Amy Horne, Sierra Business Council, research director

Dr. Horne described the publication “Investing for Prosperity” as a comprehensive approach to developing prosperous economies and sustainable communities for the future. The challenge is to make communities work for permanent residents, not just tourists. This means offering good health care, quality education, affordable housing, and a lively arts

and culture scene. She suggested capitalizing on the unique attributes of the area and creating a great people climate to attract and keep talented people.

B. Design Review Guidelines: Senior Planner Greg Newbry (*continued to July 10 meeting*)

7. REPORTS:

A. Director: 1) Intrawest will likely submit a complete application by August. 2) Housing Element update is under way; interns will conduct a condition survey this summer, and a draft might be available by year-end. Laurie Mitchel is the consultant. 3) The Cunningham property resource studies have not yet started. A subdivision in the National Forest Scenic Area likely would be extremely controversial. The landowner wanted to trade out, but he thought the land was not appraised at the value it's worth. 4) The Double Eagle resort has not built all units approved in its Use Permit. If parameters were exceeded, Mono County would require a Specific Plan with an EIR. A building permit for two to three cabins and a compliance review are under way. 5) Mono Supervisors have expressed ongoing interest in a Scenic Highway brochure. Does the Crowley community want to be excluded? 6) The communities do not want the proposed sander cranes at Caltrans maintenance stations. Continued work on scenic issues will proceed when the Mono Supervisors meet in Crowley Lake this summer. A meeting with the Scenic Highway Corridor group would produce a couple of pages on universally accepted principles.

B. Planning Commissioners: None.

C. Information item: Letter from Highway 395 Scenic Corridor Study Group re Caltrans "Context-Sensitive Solutions" policy in Mono County

8. ADJOURN MEETING: 2:05 p.m.